

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited in the United States Postal Services as First Class Mail in an envelope address to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

E. J. [Signature]
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 4 June 2001

PATENT

Attorney Docket No.: DB000575-010

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Keeth, et. al.)	
)	Examiner: Not Yet Assigned
Serial No.:	09/801,628)	
)	Art Unit: 2818
Filed:	March 8, 2001)	
Entitled:	256 MEG DYNAMIC RANDOM ACCESS MEMORY		

PETITION IN RESPONSE TO NOTICE TO FILE
CORRECTED APPLICATION PAPERS

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
ATTN: Box MISSING PARTS
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED
DEC 24 2002

Dear Sir:

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In response to the Notice to File Corrected Application Papers (copy enclosed), Applicants hereby petition the Commissioner to accept the following as proof that Figures 40A and 81A were submitted with the above-named application and to refund the accompanying petition fee of \$130 submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.117(b).

I. Introduction

Three hundred sixty-seven (367) drawings were submitted with the above-named application. Figures 40A and 81A were included in these 367 drawings. Therefore, these two figures were not omitted from the application and Applicants' \$130 petition fee should be refunded.

II. Argument

Applicants submitted a total of 367 drawings with the above-named application. Figures 40A and 81A were included among these 367 drawings. Applicants submit a copy of the return postcard, marked as Exhibit A, evidencing the submission of 367 drawings with the above named application. Applicants also submit a copy of the Utility Patent Application Transmittal form, marked as Exhibit B, evidencing the submission of 367 drawings with the above-named

application. In addition, Applicants submit copies of Figures 40A and 81A as they were submitted with the above-named application.

Applicants contend that this evidence is sufficient to prove that 367 drawings were submitted with the application and that Figures 40A and 81A were two of the 367 submitted drawings.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully contend that they have demonstrated by this evidence that Figures 40A and 81A were submitted with the above-named divisional application. Accordingly, Applicants petition the Commissioner to withdraw the Notice to File Corrected Application Papers with respect to the allegedly omitted Figures and adjust the Filing Receipt to reflect the submission of 367 drawings not 365 drawings. Applicants additionally request that Commissioner refund the \$130.00 check that was submitted with this petition to cover the petition fee under 37 C.F.R. 1.117(h).

Respectfully Submitted,



Edward L. Pencoske
Reg. No. 29,688
THORP, REED & ARMSTRONG
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, 14th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425
(412) 394-7789

Dated: 4 June, 2001

Attorneys for Applicants